arXiv:1404.4461v1 [math.AG] 17 Apr 2014

Commuting involutions on surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$

Yifan Chen

Abstract

The aim of this article is to classify the pairs (S, G), where S is a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$, G is a subgroup of the automorphism group of S and G is isomorphic to the group $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$. The Inoue surfaces with $K^2 = 7$, which are finite Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-covers of the 4-nodal cubic surface, are the first examples of such pairs. More recently, the author constructed a new family of such pairs. They are finite Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-covers of certain 6-nodal Del Pezzo surfaces of degree one. We prove that the base of the Kuranishi family of deformations of a surface in this family is smooth. We show that, in the Gieseker moduli space of canonical models of surfaces of general type, the subset corresponding to the surfaces in this family is an irreducible connected component, normal, unirational of dimension 3.

1 Introduction

The first examples of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ are constructed in the 1930's (cf. [Cam] and [Go]). Since then, these surfaces have been studied by many mathematicians, and more and more examples are constructed (cf. [BHPV, Table 14, page 304] and the references given there). Nowadays, there is a long list of examples (cf. [BCP, Tables 1-3]). Minimal smooth surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ have invariants $1 \leq K^2 \leq 9$. Surprisingly, there are few examples of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$. The first family of such surfaces is constructed by M. Inoue (cf. [In]).

The bicanonical map plays an important role in the classification of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$. It is shown in [MP1] and [MP2] that the bicanonical morphism of a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$ has degree 1 or 2; And if the bicanonical morphism has degree 2, the surface has a genus 3 hyperelliptic fibration and the fibration has five double fibers and one reducible fiber. Another important way to classify surfaces with $p_g = 0$ is to study surfaces with certain automorphisms (for example, cf. [CCM] and [KL]). Involutions on surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$ are investigated in [LS] and [Ri]. All the possibilities of the quotient surfaces and the fixed loci of the involutions are listed in these articles.

Recently, the author constructed a new family of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$ (cf. [Ch2]). In this article, we first demonstrate the process which leads to the discovery of these surfaces. We explain the main idea. Inspired by the results of [LS] (See also [Ch2, Section 6]), we consider surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$, $K^2 = 7$ and with two distinct involutions. We restrict our attention to the situation where the two involutions commute.

Yifan Chen: Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 55 Zhongguancun East Road, Haidian District, Beijing, 100190, P. R. China
email address: chenyifan1984@gmail.com

Theorem 1.1. *Let S be a minimal smooth surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. Assume that $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$. Let R_i be the divisorial part of the fixed locus of the involution g_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and let $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma := S/G$ be the quotient map. Then the canonical divisor K_S is ample and $R_i^2 = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Moreover, one of the following cases holds:*

(a) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (7, 5, 5)$*; In this case, S is an Inoue surface and $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma$ is a finite Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover of the 4-nodal cubic surface as described in Example 3.1;*

(b) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (5, 5, 3)$*; In this case, the map $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma$ a finite Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover of a 6-nodal Del Pezzo surface of degree one as described in Example 3.3;*

(c) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (5, 3, 1)$*; In this case, $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (1, 3, 1)$ and the surface Σ is a rational surface containing 8 nodes and $K_\Sigma^2 = -1$.*

We adopt the convention $K_SR_1 \geq K_SR_2 \geq K_SR_3$ in the theorem.

For simplicity, Inoue surfaces in the case (a) are referred to the surfaces with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$ constructed by M. Inoue ([In]). The description of Inoue surfaces as $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-covers of the 4-nodal cubic surface appears in [MP1, Example 4.1]. It is also shown there that the bicanonical morphisms of Inoue surfaces have degree 2. The surfaces in the case (b) are constructed by the author (cf. [Ch2]). And they have birational bicanonical morphisms.

Theorem 1.1 is proved by Proposition 2.7, Theorem 2.9 and Section 4. In particular, Subsection 4.1 provides a detailed exposition of the classification process which leads to the discovery of the surfaces in the case (b). Here we explain the key strategy. Because the Picard number of the surface S is 3, the four divisors K_S, R_1, R_2 and R_3 are linearly dependent in the $\mathrm{Pic}(S)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Combining this fact, the algebraic index theorem and the adjunction formula, we could easily analyze the configuration of the divisors R_1, R_2, R_3 and determine the number of nodes of the quotient surface Σ. When Σ is a Del Pezzo surface (the cases (a) and (b)), we get a complete classification.

However, we have difficulties when dealing with the case (c) because Σ is no longer a Del Pezzo surface. We do not know any examples for this case. We can not exclude this case at the moment. Nevertheless, we make some remarks without proof. In the case (c), from the classification table in [LS], one easily sees that the three intermediate quotient surfaces $S/g_1, S/g_2$ and S/g_3 have Kodaira dimensions $0, 1$ and 2 respectively. In particular, the surface S/g_3 is a singular numerical Campedelli surface with five nodes. Note that for surfaces in Example 3.1 and Example 3.3, all the intermediate quotient surfaces have Kodaira dimensions at most 1 (cf. [LS, Section 5], [Ch2, Section 5 and Section 6]). So it is worth finding pairs (S, G) in the case (c). We shall pursue this in the future.

The classification in Theorem 1.1 contributes to the study of the moduli of the surfaces in the case (b). The notation $\mathcal{M}_{1,7}^{\mathrm{can}}$ in the following theorem stands for the Gieseker moduli space of canonical models of surfaces of general type with $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 1$ and $K^2 = 7$ (cf. [Gi]).

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that (S, G) is a pair in the case (b) of Theorem 1.1. Then the base of the Kuranishi family of deformations of S is smooth.*

In the Gieseker moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{1,7}^{\mathrm{can}}$, the subset $\mathfrak{B}$ corresponding to the surfaces in the case (b) of Theorem 1.1 is an irreducible connected component, normal, unirational of dimension 3.

We point out that similar statements for Inoue surfaces have been achieved in [BC2]: The base of the Kuranishi family of deformations of an Inoue surface is smooth; In the Gieseker moduli space, the Inoue surfaces form a 4-dimensional irreducible connected component, normal and unirational. Theorem 1.2 will be proved in Section 5. The smoothness of the base of the

Kuranishi family is obtained by calculating the dimensions of the cohomology groups of the tangent sheaf of the surface S. And the openness of $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{1,7}^{\mathrm{can}}$ follows from this. We emphasize that the closedness of $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{1,7}^{\mathrm{can}}$ follows from the classification in Theorem 1.1.

Notation and conventions We adopt the convention that the indices $i \in \{1,2,3\}$ should be understood as residue classes modulo 3. We denote by g_1, g_2, g_3 the nonzero elements of the group $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^2$ and by $\chi_i \in G^*$ the nontrivial character orthogonal to g_i for $i = 1,2,3$. Linear equivalence between divisors is denoted by $\equiv$. Numerical equivalence between divisors is denoted by $\overset{num}{\sim}$. An $-m$-curve ($m \geq 0$) on a smooth projective surface stands for a smooth rational curve with self intersection number $-m$. A -2-curve is often called a nodal curve. We denote by $c_1(\mathcal{L})$ (respectively $c_1(D)$) the first Chern class of an invertible sheaf $\mathcal{L}$ (respectively a Cartier divisor D). The rest of the notation is standard in algebraic geometry.

2 Commuting involutions on surfaces with $p_g = 0$

Let S be a smooth irreducible projective surface over $\mathbb{C}$. A nontrivial automorphism α on S is called an involution if $\alpha^2 = \mathrm{Id}_S$. We refer to [CCM, Section 3] for the properties of an involution on a surface. We follow the ideas and the techniques there to study commuting involutions on a surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$.

2.1 General case

To study the general case, we first assume that S is a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$. Burniat surfaces are examples of such surfaces with $2 \leq K^2 \leq 6$ (cf. [Bu] and [Pe]).

Let $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma = S/G$ be the quotient map. We use Cartan's lemma (see [Car]) to analyze the local properties of the ramification locus and branch locus of π. More precisely, for $i = 1,2,3$, let R_i be the divisorial part of the fixed locus of the involution g_i and let $B_i := \pi(R_i)$. Cartan's lemma implies that the divisors R_1, R_2 and R_3 satisfy the following properties:

(i) if R_i is not 0, it is a disjoint union of irreducible smooth curves;

(ii) the divisor $R_1 + R_2 + R_3$ is normal crossing.

For each $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, if $R_{i+1} \cap R_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$, then the intersection points of R_{i+1} and R_{i+2} are isolated fixed points of the involution g_i. The image of these points under π are smooth points of Σ. Besides the intersection points of R_{i+1} and R_{i+2}, the involution g_i has l_i pairs of isolated fixed points (p_{ij_i}, q_{ij_i}) for $j_i = 1, \ldots, l_i$. The two points p_{ij_i} and q_{ij_i} of such a pair are permutated by g_{i+1} and g_{i+2}. Their images $r_{ij_i} = \pi(p_{ij_i}) = \pi(q_{ij_i})$ are nodes of Σ. The nodes r_{ij_i} ($j_i = 1, \ldots, l_i$ and $i = 1,2,3$) are the only singularities of Σ. In particular, Σ is Gorenstein. We have the following formula

$$K_S = \pi^* K_\Sigma + R_1 + R_2 + R_3. \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.1. The discussion above also shows that the divisors B_1, B_2 and B_3 are contained in the smooth locus of Σ. Moreover, the statements (i) and (ii) still hold if we replace R_i by B_i (cf. [Cat3, Theorem 2]).

Proposition 2.2. *Let S be a minimal smooth surface of general type with $p_g = 0$. Assume that $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$. Then:*

(a) *for* $i = 1, 2, 3$, $2l_i + R_{i+1}.R_{i+2} = K_S.R_i + 4$, $0 \le K_S R_i \le K_S^2$ *and the integers* $K_S R_i$, $R_{i+1}R_{i+2}$ *and* K_S^2 *are of the same parity;*

(b) $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))^{\mathrm{inv}} = \frac{1}{4}(K_S^2 + K_S R_1 + K_S R_2 + K_S R_3) + 1$ *and for* $i = 1, 2, 3$, $h^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))^{\chi_i} = \frac{1}{4}(K_S^2 + K_S R_i - K_S R_{i+1} - K_S R_{i+2})$*;*

(c) $K_\Sigma^2 = \frac{1}{4}(K_S^2 + R_1^2 + R_2^2 + R_3^2) + 6 - l_1 - l_2 - l_3$ *and the integer* $K_S^2 + R_1^2 + R_2^2 + R_3^2$ *is divisible by* 4.

Proof. The discussion above shows that the number of the isolated fixed points of the involution g_i is $2l_i + R_{i+1}R_{i+2}$. By [CCM, Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 (v)], $2l_i + R_{i+1}R_{i+2} = K_S R_i + 4 \le K_S^2 + 4$ and $2l_i + R_{i+1}R_{i+2}$ has the same parity of K_S^2. This implies (a).

Fix i. Classical formulae for double cover show that the invariant subspace of $H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))$ for the action of g_i has dimension $\frac{1}{2}(K_S^2 + K_S R_i) + 1$. In our notation, we have

$$\dim H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))^{\mathrm{inv}} + \dim H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))^{\chi_i} = \frac{1}{2}(K_S^2 + K_S R_i) + 1 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Since $\dim H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S)) = K_S^2 + 1$, assertion (b) follows.

By (2.1), we have

$$K_\Sigma^2 = \frac{1}{4}(K_S^2 + R_1^2 + R_2^2 + R_3^2) - \frac{1}{2}K_S(R_1 + R_2 + R_3) + \frac{1}{2}(R_1R_2 + R_1R_3 + R_2R_3) \tag{2.2}$$

Because Σ has only nodes, K_Σ^2 is an integer. Then assertion (c) follows from (a). □

Corollary 2.3 ([CCM, Corollary 3.4])**.** *We keep the assumption and notation introduced above and fix* $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$*. The bicanonical map* $\varphi\colon S \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{K_S^2}$ *is composed with the involution* g_i *if and only if* $K_S R_i = K_S^2$*. In this case,* $K_S R_{i+1} = K_S R_{i+2}$*.*

Let $\eta\colon W \to \Sigma$ be the minimal resolution of Σ. For each $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $\overline{N}_i$ be the disjoint union of the l_i nodal curves over the nodes r_{j_i} for $j_i = 1, \dots, l_i$ and let $\overline{B}_i := \eta^* B_i$. Let $\varepsilon\colon V \to S$ be the blowup at p_{j_i} and q_{j_i} for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $j_i = 1, \dots, l_i$. Then the $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-action on S lifts to V and $V/G \cong W$. There is a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & & V & \xrightarrow{\overline{\pi}} & W & \\ & & \varepsilon\downarrow & & \downarrow\eta & \\ R_i & \{(p_{ij_i}, q_{ij_i})\}_{j_i=1,\dots,l_i} & S & \xrightarrow[\pi]{} & \Sigma & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \overline{B}_i \\ \eta\downarrow \\ B_i = \pi(R_i) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \overline{N}_i \\ \eta\downarrow \\ \{r_{j_i} = \pi(p_{ij_i})\}_{j_i=1,\dots,l_i} \end{array} \tag{2.3}$$

The quotient map $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ is a finite flat $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover branched on the divisors $\Delta_1 := \overline{B}_1 + \overline{N}_1, \Delta_2 := \overline{B}_2 + \overline{N}_2$ and $\Delta := \overline{B}_3 + \overline{N}_3$. There are three divisors $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_3$ of W such that

$$2\mathcal{L}_i \equiv \overline{B}_{i+1} + \overline{N}_{i+1} + \overline{B}_{i+2} + \overline{N}_{i+2}, \quad \mathcal{L}_i + \overline{B}_i + \overline{N}_i \equiv \mathcal{L}_{i+1} + \mathcal{L}_{i+2} \tag{2.4}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ (cf. [Cat3, Section 2]).

Lemma 2.4. *Let*

$$D := 2K_W + \overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3 \text{ and } M := K_W + D \tag{2.5}$$

Then:

(a) *the divisor* D *is nef and big,* $\overline{\pi}^* D = \varepsilon^*(2K_S)$ *and* $D^2 = K_S^2$*;*

(b) *for each* $i = 1, 2, 3$, $\overline{B}_i^2 = R_i^2$, $\overline{B}_i\overline{B}_{i+1} = R_iR_{i+1}$ *and* $D\overline{B}_i = K_SR_i$;

(c) $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(D)) = \frac{1}{4}(K_S^2 + K_SR_1 + K_SR_2 + K_SR_3) + 1$ *and* $\dim |D| \geq 1$;

(d) *any divisor in* $|D|$ *is* 1*-connected and* $p_a(D) \geq 1$;

(e) $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(M)) = p_a(D) \geq 1$.

Assume furthermore that K_S *is ample, then:*

(f) *if* $DC = 0$ *for an irreducible curve* C*, then* C *is one of the nodal curves in* $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$;

(g) *the divisor* M *is nef.*

Proof. Note that $\pi^*B_i = 2R_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By (2.1) and from the diagram (2.3), we have

$$\overline{\pi}^*D = \overline{\pi}^*\eta^*(2K_\Sigma + B_1 + B_2 + B_3) = \varepsilon^*\pi^*(2K_\Sigma + B_1 + B_2 + B_3) = \varepsilon^*(2K_S).$$

Then $D^2 = \frac{1}{4}4K_S^2 = K_S^2$. The divisor D is nef and big because so is $2K_S$.

Assertion (b) follows from (a) and $\overline{\pi}^*\overline{B}_i = \varepsilon^*(2R_i)$.

Note that

$$K_W + \overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3 \overset{num}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}D + \frac{1}{2}(\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3).$$

The divisor D is nef and big, whereas $\frac{1}{2}(\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3)$ is effective with zero integral part, and its support has normal crossings (see Remark 2.1). Thus $H^k(W, \mathcal{O}_W(D)) = 0$ for $k = 1, 2$ by Kawamata-Vieweg vanishing theorem (cf. Corollary 5.12 (c) of [EV]). The Riemann-Roch theorem gives $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(D)) = \frac{1}{2}(D^2 - DK_W) + 1$. Then (c) follows from (b) and (2.5).

By (2.5), (b) and Proposition 2.2 (b),

$$\frac{1}{2}(D^2 + K_WD) = \frac{1}{4}(3D^2 - D\overline{B}_1 - D\overline{B}_2 - D\overline{B}_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \dim H^0(S, \mathcal{O}_S(2K_S))^{\chi_i}.$$

So $\frac{1}{2}(D^2+K_WD) \geq 0$, i.e., $p_a(D) \geq 1$. Because D is nef and big, D is 1-connected (cf. Lemma 2.6 in [Me]). This proves (d).

Assertion (e) follows from the long exact sequence obtained from

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_W(K_W) \to \mathcal{O}_W(K_W + D) \to \omega_D \to 0$$

and the fact $p_g(W) = q(W) = 0$.

Now we prove (f). Assertion (a) implies $\varepsilon^*K_S.\overline{\pi}^*C = 0$ and thus $K_S.\varepsilon_*(\overline{\pi}^*C) = 0$. Since K_S is ample, $\varepsilon_*(\overline{\pi}^*C) = 0$ and Supp $\overline{\pi}^*C$ is contained in the exceptional divisors of ε. The nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ are exactly the images of the exceptional divisors of ε under $\overline{\pi}$. So C is one of them.

For (g), assume by contradiction that $MC < 0$ for an irreducible curve C. Because M is effective by (e), we have $C^2 < 0$. Since $K_WC = (M - D)C < -DC \leq 0$, C is a (-1)-curve and $D.C = 0$. This contradicts (f). Hence M is nef. □

2.2 Surfaces with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$

In the remainder of the article, we always assume that S is a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. We list some basic properties of S. The surface S has irregularity $q(S) = 0$ and has Picard number $\rho(S) = 3$ by Noether's formula and Hodge decomposition. The expotential cohomology sequence gives $\mathrm{Pic}(S) \cong H^2(S, \mathbb{Z})$. Poincaré duality implies that the intersection form on $\mathrm{Num}(S) := \mathrm{Pic}(S)/\mathrm{Pic}(S)_{\mathrm{tor}}$ is unimodular. The the bicanonical map $\varphi\colon S \to \mathbb{P}^7$ has degree either 1 or 2 (cf. [MP1] and [MP2]). We also need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.5 (cf. [Ke, Theorem 1.4 (1) (f)]). *The surface S contains at most one nodal curve.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that S contains two nodal curves C_1 and C_2. Then $C_1C_2 \leq 1$. The matrix of the intersection numbers of K_S, C_1 and C_2 has determinant 21 or 28, either of which is not a square integer. Since $\rho(S) = 3$, this contradicts the fact that the intersection form on $\mathrm{Num}(S)$ is unimodular. □

Lemma 2.6. *(See the proof of* [Ba, Proposition 3.6]*) Let α be an involution on S and let R_α be the divisorial part of the fixed locus of α. Then $R_\alpha^2 = \pm 1$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*)$ be the trace of the induced linear map $\alpha^* \colon H^2(S, \mathbb{C}) \to H^2(S, \mathbb{C})$. Then $R_\alpha^2 = 2 - \mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*)$ by [DMP, Lemma 4.2]. The Chern classes $c_1(K_S)$ and $c_1(R_\alpha) \in H^2(S, \mathbb{C})$ are invariant under α^*. So $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*) = -1, 1$ or 3. It suffices to exclude the case $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*) = -1$.

If $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*) = -1$, then α^* has eigenvalues $-1, -1$ and 1. This implies $R_\alpha \overset{num}{\sim} rK_S$ for some positive rational number r. Because $R^2 = 2 - \mathrm{tr}(\alpha^*) = 3$ and $K_S^2 = 7$, this is impossible. □

We assume furthermore that $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^2$. We keep the same notation introduced in the previous subsection and denote by

$$A = (R_iR_j)_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq 3} \tag{2.6}$$

the matrix of intersection numbers of the ramification divisors R_1, R_2 and R_3 of the quotient map $\pi \colon S \to \Sigma = S/G$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $K_SR_1 \geq K_SR_2 \geq K_SR_3$. Since the bicanonical map φ has degree at most 2, φ is composed with at most one involution in G. Then by Proposition 2.2 (a), (b) and Corollary 2.3, one of the following cases occurs:

- if φ is composed with exact one involution in G, then

$$(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) \in \{(7,1,1), (7,3,3), (7,5,5)\}; \tag{2.7}$$

- if φ_{2K_S} is not composed with any involution in G, then

$$(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) \in \{(3,1,1), (3,3,3), (5,3,1), (5,5,3)\}. \tag{2.8}$$

Proposition 2.7. *Let S be a minimal smooth surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. Assume that $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$. Then:*

(a) *for $i = 1, 2, 3$, $R_i^2 = -1$;*

(b) *the quotient Σ is a rational surface with $K_\Sigma^2 = 7 - l_1 - l_2 - l_3$ and $\rho(\Sigma) = 3$;*

(c) *the divisors R_1, R_2, R_3 generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(S)$ and $\det A$ is a positive square integer;*

(d) *the numbers l_1, l_2 and l_3 are even integers;*

(e) *the canonical divisor K_S is ample.*

Proof. We remark that $R_i^2 = \pm 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ by Lemma 2.6. We recall in the diagram (2.3) that W is the minimal resolution of Σ. Note that $R_iR_{i+1} (= \overline{B}_i\overline{B}_{i+1})$ is a positive odd integer by (see Proposition 2.2 (a) and Lemma 2.4 (b)).

We first exclude the case $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (3,1,1)$. The algebraic index theorem and $K_S^2 = 7$ gives $(R_1 + R_2 + R_3)^2 \leq \frac{5^2}{7}$. Because $R_i^2 = \pm 1$, Proposition 2.2 (a) implies $R_i^2 = -1$

and $R_iR_{i+1}=1$ for $i=1,2,3$. Then $\overline{B}_i^2=-1$, $\overline{B}_i\overline{B}_{i+1}=1$ and $D\overline{B}_2=1$ by Lemma 2.4 (b). So $K_WB_2=\frac{1}{2}(D-\overline{B}_1-\overline{B}_2-\overline{B}_3)\overline{B}_2=0$ by (2.5). This contradicts the adjunction formula.

Now we show that W (and thus Σ) is a rational surface and $K_W^2\le 3$. By (2.5) and Lemma 2.4 (b), we have

$$DK_W=\frac{1}{2}(D^2-D\overline{B}_1-D\overline{B}_2-D\overline{B}_3)=\frac{1}{2}(K_S^2-K_SR_1-K_SR_2-K_SR_3) \tag{2.9}$$

It follows that $DK_W\in\{-5,-3,-1\}$ for all the possibilities (2.7) and (2.8). Since D is nef and big (see Lemma 2.4 (a)), W is a rational surface. The algebraic index theorem and $D^2=7$ gives $K_W^2\le 3$.

Because W is a rational surface, the Picard number $\rho(W)=10-K_W^2\ge 7$. By Proposition 2.2 (c), one of the following two cases holds:

- for $i=1,2,3$, $R_i^2=-1$ and $K_W^2=7-l_1-l_2-l_3$;
- two of the three integers R_i^2 equal 1, the third one equals -1 and $K_W^2=8-l_1-l_2-l_3$.

Assume that the latter holds. Without loss of generality, assume that $R_1^2=R_2^2=1$ and $R_3^2=-1$. Then $\rho(W)=l_1+l_2+l_3+2$ and W contains $\rho(W)-2$ disjoint nodal curves $\overline{N}_1\cup\overline{N}_2\cup\overline{N}_3$. By [DMP, Theorem 3.3], $l_1+l_2+l_3$ is an even integer. Also $\overline{B}_1,\overline{B}_3$ and these nodal curves generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(W)$. The matrix of intersection numbers of this sublattice has determinant $-2^{l_1+l_2+l_3}[1+(\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3)^2]$. Since the intersection form on $\mathrm{Num}(W)$ is unimodular, $2^{l_1+l_2+l_3}[1+(\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3)^2]$ is a positive square integer. Because $l_1+l_2+l_3$ is an even integer and $\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3$ is a positive odd integer, this is impossible. Thus the former case holds. We have proved (a) and (b).

The matrix A has determinant

$$\det A=(R_1R_2)^2+(R_1R_3)^2+(R_2R_3)^2+2(R_1R_2)(R_1R_3)(R_2R_3)-1 \tag{2.10}$$

Because the numbers R_iR_{i+1} are positive odd integer, $\det A$ is a positive integer. Since $\rho(S)=3$, R_1,R_2,R_3 generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(S)$ and therefore $\det A$ is a square integer by Poincaré duality. This proves (c).

By Lemma 2.4 (b), the matrix A is also the intersection number matrix of the divisors $\overline{B}_1,\overline{B}_2,\overline{B}_3$. It follows that $\overline{B}_1,\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ and the $l_1+l_2+l_3$ nodal curves $\overline{N}_1\cup\overline{N}_2\cup\overline{N}_3$ generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(W)$. Therefore $2^{l_1+l_2+l_3}\det A$ is a positive square integer by Poincaré duality. Hence $l_1+l_2+l_3$ is an even integer by (c).

Note that R_i (B_i) is a disjoint union of smooth irreducible curves (see Remark 2.1). We apply the Hurwitz formula for the double cover $\pi|_{R_i}\colon R_i\to B_i$ induced by the action of g_{i+1} (g_{i+2}):

$$K_SR_i+R_i^2=2(2p_a(B_i)-2)+R_i(R_{i+1}+R_{i+2})$$

By Proposition 2.2 (a), we have

$$2p_a(B_i)-2=\frac{1}{2}(K_SR_i+R_i^2-K_SR_{i+1}-K_SR_{i+2})+l_{i+1}+l_{i+2}-4 \tag{2.11}$$

For all the possibilities (2.7) and (2.8), $K_SR_i+R_i^2-K_SR_{i+1}-K_SR_{i+2}$ is divisible by 4 for each $i=1,2,3$. So $l_{i+1}+l_{i+2}$ is an even integer for $i=1,2,3$ by (2.11). We have seen that $l_1+l_2+l_3$ is an even integer. Therefore l_1,l_2,l_3 are even integers. This proves (d).

Now we prove (e). Assume by contradiction that K_S is not ample. Then S contains exactly one nodal curve C by Lemma 2.5. Thus C is G-invariant. Let $C'=\pi(C)\subset\Sigma$ and let $\bar{C}'$ be the strict transform of C' on W.

First assume that C is contained in some R_i, i.e., C' is contained in some B_i. By Remark 2.1, C' is contained in the smooth locus of Σ and $\pi^*C' = 2C$. Thus $C'^2 = -2$. It follows that $\bar{C}'$ is a nodal curve, which is disjoint from the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$. Then W contains $l_1+l_2+l_3+1$ pairwise disjoint nodal curves. By (d), this contradicts [DMP, Theorem 3.3].

Hence C is not contained in R_i, i.e., $\overline{B}_i \not\geq \bar{C}'$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By Proposition 2.4 (a), $D\bar{C}' = 0$ and $\bar{C}'^2 < 0$. It follows that $2K_W\bar{C}' = -(\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3)\bar{C}' \leq 0$. Thus $\bar{C}'$ is either a (-1)-curve or a nodal curve.

If $\bar{C}'$ is nodal curve, then $\overline{B}_i\bar{C}' = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, i.e., $R_iC = 0$ of $i = 1, 2, 3$. This contradicts (c). So $\bar{C}'$ is a (-1)-curve and $(\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3)\bar{C}' = 2$, i.e., $C'(B_1 + B_2 + B_3) = 2$. We remark that for any Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^1$, in the target space $\mathbb{P}^1$, the branch locus consists of three distinct points. Applying this remark to the cover $\pi|_C \colon C \to C'$, because C' intersects the divisorial part $B_1 + B_2 + B_3$ of the branch locus of π at two points, we conclude that C' passes through exactly one node of Σ. Equivalently, $\bar{C}'$ intersects exactly one nodal curve C_1 in $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ and $\bar{C}'C_1 = 1$. Blowing down $\bar{C}'$ and then the image of C_1, we obtain a surface W' containing $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 - 1$ disjoint nodal curves and $\rho(W') = l_1 + l_2 + l_3 + 1$. By (d), this again contradicts [DMP, Theorem 3.3].

Hence K_S is ample. □

Remark 2.8. We see in the proof of Proposition 2.7 (c) that the three curves $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_3$ and the $l_1 + l_2 + l_3$ nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(W)$.

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.9. *Let S be a minimal smooth surface of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. Assume that $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a subgroup $G = \{1, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$. Let Σ be the quotient surface S/G. Then one of the following cases occurs:*

(a) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (7, 5, 5)$*; in this case,* $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (5, 9, 7)$, $(l_1, l_2, l_3) = (2, 0, 2)$ *and* $K_\Sigma^2 = 3$*;*

(b) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (5, 5, 3)$*; in this case, one of the following cases occurs:*

(b1) $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (7, 5, 1)$, $(l_1, l_2, l_3) = (4, 2, 0)$ *and* $K_\Sigma^2 = 1$*;*

(b2) $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) \in \{(3, 5, 1), (7, 1, 1)\}$, $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 = 8$ *and* $K_\Sigma^2 = -1$*;*

(c) $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (5, 3, 1)$*; in this case,* $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (1, 3, 1)$, $(l_1, l_2, l_3) = (4, 2, 2)$ *and* $K_\Sigma^2 = -1$.

Here we keep the same notation introduced above and adopt the convention $K_SR_1 \geq K_SR_2 \geq K_SR_3$. Furthermore, since $K_SR_2 = K_SR_3$ in the case (a), we may assume $R_1R_2 \leq R_1R_3$; Similarly, we assume $R_1R_3 \geq R_2R_3$ in the case (b).

Proof. All the possibilities are listed in (2.7)-(2.8) and the case $(3, 1, 1)$ has been excluded in the proof of Proposition 2.7. For each possibility, once we determine the matrix $A = (R_iR_j)_{1\leq i\leq j\leq 3}$, we can calculate l_1, l_2, l_3 and K_Σ^2 by Proposition 2.2 (a) and by Proposition 2.7 (b). Note that $R_i^2 = -1$ by Proposition 2.7 (a). So it suffices to determine the intersection numbers R_iR_{i+1} for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

First assume $(K_SR_1, K_SR_2, K_SR_3) = (7, 3, 3)$. The algebraic index theorem gives

$$2R_1R_2 - 2 = (R_1 + R_2)^2 \leq \frac{(K_SR_1 + K_SR_2)^2}{K_S^2} = \frac{10^2}{7}$$

i.e., $R_1R_2 \leq 8$. Similarly, we have $R_1R_3 \leq 8$, $R_2R_3 \leq 3$ and $R_1R_2 + R_1R_3 + R_2R_3 \leq 13$. By Proposition 2.7 (d) and Proposition 2.2 (a), $K_SR_i - R_{i+1}R_{i+2}$ is divisible by 4. Thus $R_1R_2, R_1R_3 \in \{3, 7\}$ and $R_2R_3 = 3$. Then $\det A = 80$ or 192 by (2.10). This contradicts Proposition 2.7 (c). Hence the case $(7, 3, 3)$ is excluded.

The same reasoning will exclude the cases $(7, 1, 1)$ and $(3, 3, 3)$ and gives $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (1, 3, 1)$ for the case $(5, 3, 1)$. This proves (c).

For the case $(7, 5, 5)$, the algebraic index theorem gives $R_1R_2 \leq 12$, $R_1R_3 \leq 12$ and $R_2R_3 \leq 8$. Then Proposition 2.7 (d) and Proposition 2.2 (a) imply $R_1R_2, R_1R_3 \in \{1, 5, 9\}$ and $R_2R_3 \in \{3, 7\}$. We shall use the Lemma 2.4 (g) to narrow down the possibilities. On the minimal resolution W of the quotient surface Σ, by (2.5) and Lemma 2.4 (a)-(b), we have $DK_W = \frac{1}{2}D(D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3) = -5$ and thus $M^2 = (K_W + D)^2 = K_W^2 - 3$. The algebraic index theorem yields $K_W^2 \leq 3$. Because K_S is ample, M is nef (cf. Lemma 2.4 (g)). Then $M^2 \geq 0$ and thus $K_W^2 \geq 3$. Therefore $K_\Sigma^2 = K_W^2 = 3$. We have $R_1R_2 + R_1R_3 + R_2R_3 = 21$ by (2.2). Then $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) \in \{(9, 9, 3), (5, 9, 7), (9, 5, 7)\}$. If $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (9, 9, 3)$, $\det A = 656$ by (2.10), a contradiction to Proposition 2.7 (c). Hence $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (5, 9, 7)$ or $(9, 5, 7)$. This proves (a).

For the case $(5, 5, 3)$, the algebraic index theorem, Proposition 2.7 (d) and Proposition 2.2 (a) imply $R_1R_2 \in \{3, 7\}$ and $R_1R_3, R_2R_3 \in \{1, 5\}$. By (2.5) and Lemma 2.4 (a)-(b), we have $DK_W = \frac{1}{2}(D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3) = -3$ and $M^2 = (K_W + D)^2 = K_W^2 + 1$. The algebraic index theorem yields $K_W^2 \leq 1$. Because M is nef, $M^2 \geq 0$ and thus $K_W^2 \geq -1$. Finally by Proposition 2.7 (b) and (d), $K_W^2 = \pm 1$.

If $K_W^2 = 1$, then $R_1R_2 + R_1R_3 + R_2R_3 = 13$ by (2.2). Then $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) \in \{(3, 5, 5), (7, 5, 1), (7, 1, 5)\}$. If $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (3, 5, 5)$, then $\det A = 208$ by (2.10), a contradiction to Proposition 2.7 (c). Hence $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) = (7, 5, 1)$ or $(7, 1, 5)$.

If $K_W^2 = -1$, then by (2.2), $R_1R_2 + R_1R_3 + R_2R_3 = 9$. Then $(R_1R_2, R_1R_3, R_2R_3) \in \{(3, 5, 1), (3, 1, 5), (7, 1, 1)\}$.

We complete the proof of Theorem 2.9. □

To conclude this section, we state a lemma on fibrations on W.

Lemma 2.10. *Assume that $|F|$ is a base point free pencil of curves on W. Then $DF \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $F' = \varepsilon_*\overline{\pi}^*F$. Since $\overline{\pi}^*D = \varepsilon^*2K_S$, it follows that $K_SF' = 2DF$. If $DF = 1$, then $K_SF' = 2$. And then $F'^2 = 0$ by the algebraic index theorem. It follows that $|F'|$ induces a base point free pencil of genus 2 on S. This contradicts [Xi, Theorem 2] because $K_S^2 = 7$. □

3 Examples

We describe the known examples of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$, $K^2 = 7$ and with commuting involutions.

Example 3.1 (Inoue surfaces as bidouble covers of the 4-nodal cubic surface)**.** Inoue surfaces are the very first examples of surfaces of general type with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 = 7$ (cf. [In]). The following description is from [MP1] (see [Ri] for an equivalent description; cf. [Ch2, Section 6]). We change the notation for being coherent with Section 2.

Let $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_1', p_2', p_3'$ be the six vertices of a complete quadrilateral on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Let $\sigma\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the blowup of these points. Denote by E_i (respectively E_i') the exceptional curve of W over p_i (respectively p_i') and by L the pullback of a general line by σ.



Figure 1: Configurations of $p_1, p_1, \ldots, p_3'$

The surface W has four disjoint nodal curves, their divisor classes are

$$Z_i \equiv L - E_i - E'_{i+1} - E'_{i+2},\ Z \equiv L - E_1 - E_2 - E_3. \tag{3.1}$$

Note that Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 and Z are the proper transforms of the four sides of the quadrilateral. Let $\eta\colon W \to \Sigma$ be the morphism contracting there curves. The surface Σ has four nodes, $-K_\Sigma$ is ample and Σ is the 4-nodal cubic surface.

Let Γ_1, Γ_2 and Γ_3 be the proper transforms of the three diagonals of the quadrilateral, i.e., $\Gamma_i \equiv L - E_i - E'_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. For each $i = 1, 2, 3$, W has a pencil of rational curves $|F_i| := |2L - E_{i+1} - E_{i+2} - E'_{i+1} - E'_{i+2}|$. Note that $-K_W \equiv \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 \equiv \Gamma_i + F_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Now we define three effective divisors on W

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &:= \Gamma_1 + F_2 + Z_1 + Z_3, \\ \Delta_2 &:= \Gamma_2 + F_3, \\ \Delta_3 &:= \Gamma_3 + F_1 + F'_1 + Z_2 + Z. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Here we require that F_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ and F'_1 are smooth 0-curves and the divisor $\Delta := \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3$ has only nodes. There is a smooth finite G-cover $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ branched on the divisors Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3. The (set theoretic) inverse image $\overline{\pi}^{-1}Z_i$ or $\overline{\pi}^{-1}Z$ is a disjoint union of two (-1)-curves. Let $\varepsilon\colon V \to S$ be the blowdown of these eight (-1)-curves. From the construction, there is a finite G-cover $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma$ such that the diagram (2.3) commutes. And S is a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g(S) = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. Moreover, K_S is ample and the bicanonical map of S has degree two.

In the notation of Section 2, $\overline{B}_1 = \Gamma_1 + F_2, \overline{B}_2 = \Gamma_2 + F_3, \overline{B}_3 = \Gamma_3 + F_1 + F'_1, \overline{N}_1 = Z_1 + Z_3, \overline{N}_2 = 0, \overline{N}_3 = Z_2 + Z$ and $D = -K_W + F'_1$. It follow that $(D\overline{B}_1, D\overline{B}_2, D\overline{B}_3) = (7, 5, 5)$ and $(\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) = (5, 9, 7)$. So the Inoue surfaces satisfy Theorem 2.9 (a) by Lemma 2.4 (b).

Remark 3.2. We will need the following remarks in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (a). See Subsection 4.3.

(1) Note that W contains exactly nine (-1)-curves E_i, E'_i and Γ_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$. There are exactly three (-1)-curves Γ_1, Γ_2 and Γ_3, which are disjoint from the nodal curves.

(2) If we replace $Z_1 + Z_3$ in Δ_1 by $Z_2 + Z$ and replace $Z_2 + Z$ in Δ_3 by $Z_1 + Z_3$, these new Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3 still define a smooth finite $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover. In this way, we get another 4-dimensional family of surfaces of general type. However, this family is the same as the original one.

Indeed, let α be the involution on $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that $\alpha(p_k) = p'_k$ and $\alpha(p'_k) = p_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then $\alpha(p_3) = p_3$ and $\alpha(p'_3) = p'_3$. It induces an involution α' on W. The (-1)-curves $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ are α'-invariant and the divisors classes of F_1, F_2, F_3 are α'-invariant. We also have $\alpha'(Z_1) = Z_2, \alpha'(Z_2) = Z_1, \alpha'(Z_3) = Z$ and $\alpha'(Z) = Z_3$.

(3) Observe that the two nodal curves in the same Δ_k ($k = 1, 3$) are in the same singular member of the pencil $|F_2|$. Indeed, the singular members of the pencil $|F_2|$ are $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_3$, $Z_1 + 2E_2' + Z_3$ and $Z_2 + 2E_2 + Z$.

Example 3.3 (Bidouble covers of singular Del Pezzo surfaces of degree one)**.** See [Ch2, Section 2 and Section 3] for details. Let p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 be four points of $\mathbb{P}^2$ in general position and let p_j' be the infinitely near point over p_j corresponding to the line $\overline{p_0p_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Finally, let p be the eighth point satisfying the following Zariski open conditions:

(I) $p \notin \cup_{i=1}^3 \{\overline{p_0p_i} : x_{i+1} = x_{i+2}\} \cup_{i=1}^3 \{\overline{p_{i+1}p_{i+2}} : x_i = 0\}$;

(II) $p \notin c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3$, where c_j is the unique conic passing through the five points $p_i, p_{i+1}, p_{i+1}', p_{i+2}$ and p_{i+2}'.



Figure 2: Configurations of $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_3'$ and p

Denote by E_j (respectively E_j', E) the **total transform** of the point p_j (respectively p_j', p), and by L the pullback of a general line by σ. Then $\mathrm{Pic}(W) = \mathbb{Z}L \oplus \mathbb{Z}E_0 \oplus \oplus_{j=1}^3 (\mathbb{Z}E_j \oplus \mathbb{Z}E_j') \oplus \mathbb{Z}E$ and $-K_W \equiv 3L - E_0 - \sum_{j=1}^3 (E_j + E_j') - E$. We list some properties of the surface W.

(1) The surface W is a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree one.

(2) There are exactly six nodal curves on W. Their divisor classes are

$$C_j \equiv L - E_0 - E_j - E_j', \; C_j' \equiv E_j - E_j' \text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3. \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\eta\colon W \to \Sigma$ be the morphism contracting there curves. The surface Σ has six nodes and $-K_\Sigma$ is ample.

(3) The pencil of lines on $\mathbb{P}^2$ passing through p_0 induces a fibration $g\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^1$. Denote by F a general fiber of g. Then $F \equiv L - E_0$. The fibration g has exactly four singular fibers:



for $j = 1, 2, 3$, where Γ is the strict transform of the line $\overline{p_0p}$ and $\Gamma \equiv L - E_0 - E$.

(4) The linear system of $|-2K_W - \Gamma|$ consists of a (-1)-curve $\overline{B}_2$ and the linear system of $|-2K_W - E|$ consists of a (-1)-curve $\overline{B}_3$. We have $\overline{B}_2\Gamma = \overline{B}_3E = 3$ and $\overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3 = \overline{B}_2E = \overline{B}_3\Gamma = 1$. Moreover, the divisor $\Gamma + E + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3$ has only nodes.

Now we define three effective divisors on W

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &:= F_b + \Gamma + (C_1 + C_1' + C_2 + C_2') \equiv 4L - 4E_0 - 2E_1' - 2E_2' - E, \\ \Delta_2 &:= \overline{B}_2 + (C_3 + C_3') \equiv -2K_W - 2E_3' + E, \\ \Delta_3 &:= \overline{B}_3 \equiv -2K_W - E. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Here we require that the curve F_b is a smooth fiber of g and the divisor $\Delta := \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3$ has only nodes. We also define three divisors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= -2K_W - E_3', \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= -K_W + (2L - 2E_0 - E_1' - E_2' - E), \\ \mathcal{L}_3 &= -K_W + (2L - 2E_0 - E_1' - E_2' - E_3'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

It follows that Δ_i and $\mathcal{L}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ satisfy (2.4). These data define a smooth finite G-cover $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ branched on the divisors Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3. The (set theoretic) inverse image $\overline{\pi}^{-1}C_j$ or $\overline{\pi}^{-1}C_j'$ is a disjoint union of two (-1)-curves. Let $\varepsilon\colon V \to S$ be the blowdown of these twelve (-1)-curves. From the construction, there is a finite G-cover $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma$ such that the diagram (2.3) commutes. And S is a smooth minimal surface of general type with $p_g(S) = 0$ and $K_S^2 = 7$. Moreover, K_S is ample and the bicanonical map of S is birational.

In the notation of Section 2, $\overline{B}_1 = F_b + \Gamma, \overline{N}_1 = C_1 + C_1' + C_2 + C_2', \overline{N}_2 = C_3 + C_3', \overline{N}_3 = 0$ and $D = -2K_W + \Gamma$. Thus $(D\overline{B}_1, D\overline{B}_2, D\overline{B}_3) = (5, 5, 3)$ and $(\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) = (7, 5, 1)$. So these surfaces satisfy Theorem 2.9 (b1) by Lemma 2.4 (b).

We will need the following lemma to study deformations of surfaces in Example 3.3. See Section 5.

Lemma 3.4. *Let W be a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree one as in Example 3.3. The linear system $|-K_W + E_3' - E|$ consists of a (-1)-curve Λ. Moreover, Λ intersects F_b transversely and $\Lambda F_b = 2$.*

Proof. Note that $(-K_W + E_3' - E)^2 = -1$ and $K_W(-K_W + E_3' - E) = -1$. Also it is clear that $h^0(W, 2K_W - E_3' + E) = 0$. The Riemann-Roch theorem yields $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(-K_W + E_3' - E)) \geq 1$. By (3.3), we can easily show that $-K_W + E_3' - E - C_j$ and $-K_W + E_3' - E - C_j'$ are not effective, i.e., that any effective divisor Λ in $|-K_W + E_3' - E|$ does not contain C_j or C_j' for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Because the nodal curves $C_1, \ldots, C_3'$ are exactly all the nodal curves of W and $-K_W\Lambda = 1$, we conclude that Λ is irreducible and thus Λ is a (-1)-curve. We have $\Lambda F_b = (-K_W + E_3' - E)F_b = 2$. It remains to show that Λ intersects F_b transversely.

Note that $\Lambda C_k = \Lambda C_k' = 0$ $(k = 1, 2)$ and $\Lambda C_3 = \Lambda C_3' = 1$. The linear system $|C_3 + 2\Lambda + C_3'|$ induces a genus 0 fibration $g'\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^1$. The same reasoning as the proof of [Ch2, Proposition 2.5] (3) shows g' has exactly four singular fibers



where the (-2)-curves are $C_1, \ldots, C_3'$ and Λ_j is a (-1)-curve for $j = 1, 2, 3$. The curve Λ is one of the curves Λ_1, Λ_2 and Λ_3.

Since $F_b(C_3 + 2\Lambda + C_3') = 4$, the restriction $g'|_{F_b}\colon F_b \to \mathbb{P}^1$ has degree 4. The curve F_b is disjoint from the nodal curves, so $F_b\Lambda_j = 2$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Because the multiplicity of Λ_j in the singular fiber is 2, the ramification divisor of $g'|_{F_b}$ has degree at least $2 \times 3 = 6$, and it has degree 6 if and only if F_b intersects Λ_j transversely for $j = 1, 2, 3$. On the other hand, the Hurwitz formula implies that ramification divisor of $g'|_{F_b}$ has degree 6. We conclude that F_b intersects Λ_j transversely for $j = 1, 2, 3$. □

4 Classification

The whole section is devoted to prove Theorem 1.1. We have proved that K_S is ample, $R_i^2 = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and that Σ is a rational surface containing $l_1 + l_2 + l_3$ nodes in Proposition 2.7.

So Theorem 1.1 (c) follows from Theorem 2.9 (c). We deal with one of the three cases (a), (b1) and (b2) in Theorem 2.9 in each subsection. In Subsetion 4.1, we first show that the surfaces in the case (b1) are surfaces in Example 3.3. This case is the most complicated one. We give detailed proofs for this case and set up the classification process. We then proceed analogously to exclude the case (b2) in Subseciton 4.2 and to show that the surfaces in case (a) are Inoue surfaces in Subsection 4.3. This will complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We make some general remarks and recall some general facts.

Remark 4.1. (1) We consider the bidouble cover $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ more often than the quotient map $\pi\colon S \to \Sigma$ (See the diagram (2.3) for the notation). We remark that, on the smooth rational surface W, linear equivalence and numerical equivalence between divisors are the same.

(2) We have $\overline{B}_i^2 = -1$, $D\overline{B}_i = K_S R_i$ and $\overline{B}_i\overline{B}_{i+1} = R_i R_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. See Lemma 2.4 (b).

(3) The curve $\overline{B}_i$ is a disjoint union of irreducible smooth curves for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The curve $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3$ is normal crossing and it is disjoint from the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$. See Remark 2.1. The three curves $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_3$ and the $l_1 + l_2 + l_3$ nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ generate a sublattice of $\mathrm{Num}(W)$. See Remark 2.8.

(4) The curve $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3$ does not contain any nodal curve; Otherwise, W contains at least $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 + 1$ pairwise disjoint nodal curves. But this contradicts Proposition 2.7 (b), (d) and [DMP, Theorem 3.3].

(5) The divisor $M := K_W + D$ is nef. See Lemma 2.4 (g).

4.1 Bidouble covers of Singular Del Pezzo Surfaces of Degree one

In this subsection, we treat the case (b1) of Theorem 2.9. Our aim is to prove that S is a finite Galois $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$-cover of a singular Del Pezzo surface of degree one as described in Example 3.3.

In this case, we have

$$(D\overline{B}_1, D\overline{B}_2, D\overline{B}_3) = (5, 5, 3),\ (\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) = (7, 5, 1) \text{ and } K_W^2 = 1 \tag{4.1}$$

The minimal resolution W of the quotient surface Σ has six disjoint nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$, where $\overline{N}_1$ consists of four nodal curves and $\overline{N}_2$ consists of two nodal curves (Recall that $l_1 = 4, l_2 = 2$ and $l_3 = 0$). We also have

$$\begin{aligned} DK_W &= \frac{1}{2}D(D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3) = -3, & DM &= D(K_W + D) = 4, \\ K_W M &= K_W(K_W + D) = -2, & M^2 &= M(K_W + D) = 2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The first lemma describes the surface W.

Lemma 4.2. *The surface W is a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree one.*

Proof. We have shown $K_W^2 = 1$. It suffices to show that $-K_W$ is nef. Assume by contradiction that $-K_W C < 0$ for an irreducible curve C. The Riemann-Roch theorem implies $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(-K_W)) \geq 2$. So $C^2 < 0$ and C is contained in the fixed part of $|-K_W|$. Because both D and M are nef, $1 \leq K_W C + DC = MC \leq M(-K_W) = 2$. Lemma 2.4 (f) implies $DC \geq 1$. It follows that $K_W C = DC = 1$ and $MC = 2$. So $C^2 = -1$ or -3 by the adjunction formula. On the other hand, because $M(-K_W - C) = 0$ and $M^2 = 2$ by (4.2), the algebraic index theorem yields $(-K_W - C)^2 = 3 + C^2 < 0$. This gives a contradiction. Hence $-K_W$ is nef

and W is a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree one. $\square$

The next lemma describes the branch divisors $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$.

Lemma 4.3. *The divisors $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_3$ satisfy the following properties.*

(a) *The curve $\overline{B}_1$ is reducible: $\overline{B}_1 = F_b + \Gamma$, where Γ is a (-1)-curve and $\Gamma \equiv M + K_W$, while F_b is a 0-curve and $DF_b = 4$.*

(b) *The divisors $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are (-1)-curves. Moreover, $\overline{B}_2 \equiv -2K_W - \Gamma$ and $\overline{B}_3 \equiv -2K_W - F_b + \Gamma$.*

Proof. Because $\overline{B}_i^2 = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, by (2.5) and (4.1), we have

$$K_W\overline{B}_1 = -3 \text{ and } K_W\overline{B}_2 = K_W\overline{B}_3 = -1.$$

Note that $-K_W$ has positive intersection numbers with each irreducible component of $\overline{B}_i$ by Remark 4.1 (4).

Since $-K_W\overline{B}_1 = 3$ and $\overline{B}_1^2 = -1$, the algebraic index theorem and the adjunction formula show that $\overline{B}_1$ is a disjoint union of a (-1)-curve Γ and a 0-curve F_b. Now we prove that $\Gamma \equiv M + K_W$. Note that $\overline{B}_1(M + K_W) = \overline{B}_1(2K_W + D) = -1$. It suffices to show that the linear system $|M + K_W|$ consists of a (-1)-curve. Since M is nef and big, it is 1-connected. The long exact sequence obtained from

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_W(K_W) \to \mathcal{O}_W(M + K_W) \to \omega_M \to 0$$

gives $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(M + K_W)) = p_a(M) = 1$. Since $D(M + K_W) = 1$, by Lemma 2.4 (f), we may assume that $K_W + M \equiv \Phi + \Psi$, where Φ is an irreducible curve with $D\Phi = 1$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(\Psi) \in \overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$. So $\Phi^2 \leq 0$ by the algebraic index theorem. Since $K_W\Phi = K_W(M + K_W) = -1$, Φ is a (-1)-curve. Then $\Psi^2 = (M + K_W - \Phi)^2 = (2K_W + D - \Phi)^2 = 0$ and thus $\Psi = 0$. Hence $|M + K_W|$ consists of a (-1)-curve and $\Gamma \equiv M + K_W$. It follows that $D\Gamma = DM + DK_W = 1$ and $DF_b = D(\overline{B}_1 - \Gamma) = 4$. This proves (a).

For (b), because $-K_W\overline{B}_2 = -K_W\overline{B}_3 = 1$, the curves $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are irreducible. Since $\overline{B}_2^2 = \overline{B}_3^2 = -1$, $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are (-1)-curves. Because $\Gamma \equiv M + K_W = 3K_W + \overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3$ and $\overline{B}_1 \equiv F_b + \Gamma$, we have $\overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3 \equiv -4K_W - F_b$. So it suffices to show $\overline{B}_2 \equiv -2K_W - \Gamma$.

Note that $\overline{B}_2 - (-2K_W - \Gamma) \equiv 3D - 2\overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - 2\overline{B}_3$. It follows that $[\overline{B}_2 - (-2K_W - \Gamma)]^2 = 0$ and $D[\overline{B}_2 - (-2K_W - \Gamma)] = 0$. The algebraic index theorem yields $\overline{B}_2 \equiv -2K_W - \Gamma$. $\square$.

The next lemma describes a rational fibration on W. See [DMP, Theorem 3.3].

Lemma 4.4. *The linear system $|F_b|$ induces a genus 0 fibration $g\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^1$.*

(a) *The curve Γ is contained in a singular fiber F_0 of g and $F_0 = \Gamma + E$, where E is a (-1)-curve and $E\Gamma = 1$.*

(b) *The fibration g has exactly four singular fibers: F_0 and $C_j + 2E'_j + C'_j$ $(j = 1, 2, 3)$, where E'_j is a (-1)-curve, while C_j and C'_j are the nodal curves contained in $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$.*

(c) *If E_0 is a smooth section of g and $E_0^2 < 0$, then E_0 is a (-1)-curve.*

Proof. It is well known that a 0-curve on a smooth rational surface induces a genus 0 fibration. Because $F_b\Gamma = 0$, Γ is contained in a fiber F_0 of g. Similarly, the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$ are contained in the fibers of g. Denote by F the general fiber of g.

Assume that E is an irreducible component of F_0 such that $E\Gamma = 1$. Then E is a smooth rational curve with $E^2 < 0$. Since $\overline{B}_2$ is a (-1)-curve and $\overline{B}_2 F = (-2K_W - \Gamma)F = 4$, $\overline{B}_2 \neq E$ and thus $\overline{B}_2 E = (-2K_W - \Gamma)E \geq 0$. It follows that $K_W E < 0$. The adjunction formula shows that E is (-1)-curve. Then the Zariski lemma gives $F_0 = \Gamma + E$.

Assume that F_s is a singular fiber different from F_0 and A is an irreducible component of F_s. Then $A\Gamma = 0$ since A and Γ are in different fibers. Then $2K_W A = (\Gamma - D)A = -DA$. By Proposition 2.4 (f), A is either a nodal curve in $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$ or a (-1)-curve with $DA = 2$. Because $DF = 4$, any singular fiber has one of the following types:



Note that each fiber of the first two types contributes 2 to the Picard number $\rho(W)$. The surface W contains six disjoint nodal curves and $\rho(W) = 10 - K_W^2 = 9$. We have seen that g has one fiber $F_0 = \Gamma + E$ of the third type. So the other fibers are of the first type.

Assume that E_0 is a smooth section of g with $E_0^2 < 0$. Lemma 4.2 implies $K_W E_0 \leq 0$. If $K_W E_0 = 0$, then E_0 is a nodal curve. Also $E_0(\Gamma + E) = E_0 F = 1$. By Lemma 4.3 (b), either $\overline{B}_2 E_0 = -1$ or $\overline{B}_3 E_0 = -1$. This is impossible because $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are (-1)-curves. Hence $K_W E_0 < 0$ and E_0 is a (-1)-curve by the adjunction formula. □

Lemma 4.5. *The surface W contains exactly six nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$.*

Proof. Assume that C is a nodal curve different from the six nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$. According to Lemma 4.4 (b), C is not contained in the fibers of g. Lemma 4.4 (c) implies $FC \geq 2$. Then, by Lemma 4.3 (b), either $\overline{B}_2 C < 0$ or $\overline{B}_3 C < 0$. This contradicts that $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are (-1)-curves. Thus W contains exactly six nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2$. □

We have shown in diagram (2.3) that the cover $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ is branched on $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{N}_1, \overline{B}_2 + \overline{N}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$, where

$$\overline{B}_1 = F_b + \Gamma, \qquad \overline{B}_2 \equiv -2K_W - \Gamma, \qquad \overline{B}_3 \equiv -2K_W - E \equiv -2K_W - F + \Gamma \tag{4.3}$$

Now we consider how the nodal curves $C_1, \ldots, C_3'$ in the fibers of g (see Lemma 4.4) distribute along two divisors $\overline{N}_1$ and $\overline{N}_2$. We conclude that $\overline{N}_1$ and $\overline{N}_2 + F$ are divisible by 2 in $\mathrm{Pic}(W)$ from (2.4) and (4.3). Since $C_i + C_i' \equiv F - 2E_i'$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we may assume

$$\overline{N}_1 = (C_1 + C_1') + (C_2 + C_2') \equiv 2F - 2E_1' - 2E_2',\ \overline{N}_2 = C_3 + C_3' \equiv F - 2E_3'. \tag{4.4}$$

Finally, we shall show that W arises as the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^2$ as described in Example 3.3. We first claim that there exists a smooth section E_0 of g, such that E_0 is a (-1)-curve, $E_0\Gamma = 1$ and $E_0 E = 0$. Let $p\colon W \to W'$ be the morphism blowing down E. Because $K_{W'}^2 = 2$, the fiberation $g'\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^1$ induced by g is not relatively minimal. Thus g' has a smooth section E_0' such that $E_0'^2 < 0$. The strict transform E_0 of E_0' is a smooth section of g and thus it is a (-1)-curve by Lemma 4.4 (c). It follows that $E_0\Gamma = 1$ and $E_0 E = 0$. The claim is proved.

Since $F \equiv C_j + 2E_j' + C_j'$, we have $E_0 E_j' = 0$. After possibly relabeling C_j and C_j' for each $j = 1, 2, 3$, we may assume that $E_0 C_j = 1$ and $E_0 C_j' = 0$.

Blowing down $E_j' (j = 1, 2, 3)$, then blowing down the image of $C_j' (j = 1, 2, 3)$ and finally blowing down E_0 and E, we obtain a birational morphism $\sigma\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^2$. Let $p_0 := \sigma(E_0), p_1 :=$

$(E'_j \cup C'_j)$ $(j = 1, 2, 3)$ and $p := \sigma(E)$. Denote by p'_j the infinitely near point over p_j corresponding to the line $\overline{p_j p_0}$. Note that the exceptional divisor on W corresponding to p'_j is E'_j. The fibration g corresponds to the pencil of lines passing through the point p_0. Then Lemma 4.4 (b) implies that p_0, p_i, p_{i+1} are not collinear and p_0, p, p_i are not collinear for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. Lemma 4.5 implies that p_1, p_2, p_3 are not collinear and the point p satisfies the conditions (I) and (II) in Example 3.3. Otherwise, for example, if $p \in c_1$, then the strict transform of c_1 on W is a nodal curve, which is different from $C_1, \ldots, C'_3$, a contradiction to Lemma 4.5.

Hence we have shown that S is a surface in Example 3.3.

4.2 Exclusion

Our next goal is to exclude the case (b2) of Theorem 2.9. We assume by contradiction that there is a pair (S, G) satisfying the property (b2) of Theorem 2.9. In this case, we have

$$(D\overline{B}_1, D\overline{B}_2, D\overline{B}_3) = (5, 5, 3),\ (\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) \in \{(3, 5, 1), (7, 1, 1)\} \text{ and } K_W^2 = -1 \quad (4.5)$$

The minimal resolution W of the quotient surface Σ has eight pairwise disjoint nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} DK_W &= \frac{1}{2}D(D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3) = -3, & DM &= D(K_W + D) = 4, \\ K_W M &= K_W(K_W + D) = -4, & M^2 &= M(K_W + D) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Lemma 4.6. (a) *The linear system $|M|$ is composed with a pencil $|F|$ and $M \equiv 2F$, where $|F|$ is a base point free pencil of rational curves and $DF = 2$.*

(b) *Let $g\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^1$ be the fibration defined by $|F|$. Then g has exactly five singular fibers: $E_1 + E_2$ and $C_j + 2\Gamma_j + C'_j$ $(j = 1, 2, 3, 4)$, where E_1, E_2 and Γ_j are (-1)-curves, while C_j and C'_j are the nodal curves in $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$. Moreover, $DE_1 = DE_2 = 1$.*

Proof. Lemma 2.4 (e) gives $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(M)) = p_a(D) = 3$. Assume $|M| = |\Phi| + \Psi$, where $|\Phi|$ is the moving part and Ψ is the fixed part. Because both M and Φ is nef, and $M^2 = 0$, we have $M\Phi = M\Psi = 0$ and $\Phi^2 = \Phi\Psi = \Psi^2 = 0$. Then $|\Phi|$ is composed a pencil $|F|$ and $\Phi \equiv 2F$. Lemma 2.10 implies $DF \geq 2$. Since $DM = 4$ and $D\Phi = 4$, we have $D\Psi = 0$. Then Lemma 2.4 (f) and $\Psi^2 = 0$ imply $\Psi = 0$. Thus $M \equiv \Phi \equiv 2F$, $DF = 2$ and $K_W F = -2$. Therefore $|F|$ is a base point free pencil of rational curves.

Since $F\overline{N}_i = \frac{1}{2}(D + K_W)\overline{N}_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ are contained in the singular fibers of g. Assume that A is an irreducible component of a singular fiber of g. Then A is a smooth rational curve with $A^2 < 0$. Note that $0 = 2FA = MA = K_W A + DA \geq K_W A = -2 - A^2$. By Lemma 2.4 (f), A is either one of the nodal curves in $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$ or a (-1)-curve with $DA = 1$. The rest of the proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.4 (a)-(b). □

Lemma 4.7. (a) *The divisors $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ satisfy the following properties: $\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2 = 7, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3 = \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3 = 1$ and $\overline{B}_i F = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

(b) *The divisor $\overline{B}_3$ is an irreducible smooth elliptic curve and $\overline{B}_3 \equiv -K_W$.*

Proof. Note that $F \overset{num}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}(D + K_W) \overset{num}{\sim} \frac{1}{4}(3D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3)$ and $F\overline{N}_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By (2.4), $F\overline{B}_1, F\overline{B}_2$ and $F\overline{B}_3$ are of the same parity. If $(\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) = (3, 5, 1)$, then $F\overline{B}_1 = 2$ and $F\overline{B}_2 = 3$. This gives a contradiction. Hence $\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2 = 7$ and $\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3 = \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3 = 1$. It follows that $F\overline{B}_i = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

By Remark 2.8, from the intersection numbers $D\overline{B}_i$ and $D\overline{N}_i = 0$, we can write D as a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$. It turns out to be a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination: $D \equiv \overline{B}_1+\overline{B}_2-\overline{B}_3$. Since $\mathrm{Pic}(W)$ has no torsion, $\overline{B}_3 \equiv -K_W$ by (2.5). Assume that $\overline{B}_3 = \Phi_1+\ldots+\Phi_t$, where the curves Φ_k are irreducible, smooth and pairwise disjoint. Then $\Phi_1^2 = \Phi_1\overline{B}_3 = -K_W\Phi_1$. It follows that Φ_1 is a smooth elliptic curve. The long exact sequence obtained from

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_W(K_W) \to \mathcal{O}_W(K_W + \Phi_1) \to \omega_{\Phi_1} \to 0$$

gives $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(K_W + \Phi_1)) = 1$. Since $K_W + \Phi_1 \equiv -\Phi_2 - \ldots - \Phi_t$, $t = 1$ and $\overline{B}_3 = \Phi_1$. This is the desired conclusion. □

Lemma 4.8. *The linear systems $|\overline{B}_3 + E_1|$ and $|\overline{B}_3 + E_2|$ are base point free pencil of elliptic curves.*

Proof. Note that $(\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2)E_k = (D - K_W)E_k = (M - 2K_W)E_k = 2$ for $k = 1, 2$. Since E_k is disjoint from the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_2 \cup \overline{N}_3$, by (2.4), $\overline{B}_1E_k, \overline{B}_2E_k$ and $\overline{B}_3E_k$ are of the same parity. Since $\overline{B}_3E_k = -K_WE_k = 1$, $\overline{B}_1E_k$ and $\overline{B}_2E_k$ are odd integers.

Fix $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 \not\geq E_k$. Then $\overline{B}_1E_k = \overline{B}_2E_k = 1$. The intersection number matrix of $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_3$ and E_k is nondegenerate. This contradicts Remark 2.8. Therefore $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 \geq E_k$ for $k = 1, 2$.

Without loss of generality, we assume $\overline{B}_1 \geq E_1$. Then $\overline{B}_1E_1 = -1$ and $\overline{B}_2E_1 = 3$. By Remark 2.8, we may write E_1 as the $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_3$. That is $E_1 \overset{num}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}(\overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_3)$, i.e., $\overline{B}_1 \equiv 2E_1 + \overline{B}_3$. Then $\overline{B}_1E_2 = (2E_1 + \overline{B}_3)E_2 = 3$ and $\overline{B}_2E_2 = 2 - \overline{B}_1E_2 = -1$. Thus $\overline{B}_2 \geq E_2$ and $\overline{B}_2 \equiv 2E_2 + \overline{B}_3$ again by Remark 2.8.

For $k = 1, 2$, the divisor $\overline{B}_k$ is a disjoint union of smooth irreducible curves, so is $\overline{B}_k - E_k$. Also $\overline{B}_k - E_k$ and $\overline{B}_3 + E_k$ have no common irreducible component (cf. Remark 2.1). Since $\overline{B}_k \equiv \overline{B}_3 + 2E_k$, $\overline{B}_k - E_k$ and $\overline{B}_3 + E_k$ generate a base point free pencil of elliptic curves for $k = 1, 2$. □

We are now in a position to deduce a contradiction. Let $P := E_1 + E_2 + \overline{B}_3$. We have proved that $E_1E_2 = \overline{B}_3E_1 = \overline{B}_3E_2 = 1$ and $\overline{B}_3, E_1, E_2$ have no common points (cf. Remark 2.1). Because $|E_1 + E_2|, |\overline{B}_3 + E_1|$ and $|\overline{B}_3 + E_2|$ are base point free pencils of curves, $|P|$ is base point free. Let F_1 be a general element of $|\overline{B}_3 + E_1|$. Then there is an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_W(E_2) \to \mathcal{O}_W(P) \to \mathcal{O}_{F_1}(P) \to 0.$$

It is easy to see that $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(E_2)) = 1$ and $h^1(W, \mathcal{O}_W(E_2)) = 0$. Since F_1 is smooth elliptic curve and $PF_1 = 2$, we have $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_{F_1}(P)) = 2$. Then $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(P)) = 3$ and the trace of $|P|$ on F_1 is complete. The linear system $|P|$ defines a morphism $f\colon W \to \mathbb{P}^2$ of degree $P^2 = 3$. However, the restriction of f on a general element F_1 in $|\overline{B}_3 + E_1|$ has degree $PF_1 = 2$, which was supposed to be a factor of $\deg f = 3$. This gives a contradiction and we exclude the case (b2) in Theorem 2.9.

4.3 Inoue Surfaces

The subsection is devoted to classify the pairs (S, G) satisfying the property (a) of Theorem 2.9. We show that S is an Inoue surface in Example 3.1.

In this case, we have

$$(D\overline{B}_1, D\overline{B}_2, D\overline{B}_3) = (7, 5, 5), (\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2, \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3, \overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3) = (5, 9, 7) \text{ and } K_W^2 = 3 \qquad (4.7)$$

The minimal resolution W of the quotient surface Σ has four disjoint nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_3$, where $\overline{N}_1$ consists of two nodal curves and so does $\overline{N}_3$ (Recall that $l_1 = 2, l_2 = 0$ and $l_3 = 2$). We also have

$$\begin{aligned} DK_W &= \frac{1}{2}D(D - \overline{B}_1 - \overline{B}_2 - \overline{B}_3) = -5, & DM &= D(K_W + D) = 2, \\ K_W M &= K_W(K_W + D) = -2, & M^2 &= M(K_W + D) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

The following lemma describes the surface W.

Lemma 4.9. (a) *The linear system $|M|$ is a base point free pencil of rational curves.*

(b) *The surface W is a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree three.*

Proof. The linear system $|M|$ is a pencil of curves by Proposition 2.4 (e). Since $M^2 = 0$ by (4.8), it suffices to prove that M is base point free. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.6 (a).

The Riemann-Roch Theorem implies $h^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W(-K_W)) \geq 4$. To prove (b), it suffices to prove that $-K_W$ is nef. The rest of the proof runs as that of Lemma 4.2. □

The next lemma determines the branch divisors $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$.

Lemma 4.10. *The divisors $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are as follows:*

$$\overline{B}_1 = \Gamma_1 + F_2, \qquad \overline{B}_2 = \Gamma_2 + F_3, \qquad \overline{B}_3 = \Gamma_3 + F_1 + F_1', \tag{4.9}$$

where the curves Γ_i are (-1)-curves, F_i and F_1' are 0-curves, $\Gamma_i + F_i \equiv -K_W$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 \equiv -K_W$. Moreover, $F_1, F_1' \in |M|$.

Proof. By (2.5) and (4.7), we have

$$K_W\overline{B}_1 = K_W\overline{B}_2 = -3 \text{ and } K_W\overline{B}_3 = -5.$$

Because $M\overline{B}_3 = (D+K_W)\overline{B}_3 = 0$, $\overline{B}_3$ is contained in some divisors of the linear system $|M|$. The Zariski's lemma, the algebraic index theorem and the adjunction formula imply $\overline{B}_3 = \Gamma_3+F_1+F_1'$, where Γ_3 is (-1)-curve, while F_1 and F_1' are two 0-curves in $|M|$ (See Remark 4.1 (3) and (4)). The same reasoning applies to $\overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ yields $\overline{B}_1 = \Gamma_1 + F_2$ and $\overline{B}_2 = \Gamma_2 + F_3$, where Γ_1 and Γ_2 are (-1)-curves, while F_2 and F_3 are 0-curves.

We claim that $\Gamma_i\Gamma_{i+1} = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Actually, since $-K_W(\Gamma_i + \Gamma_{i+1}) = 2$, the algebraic index theorem implies $\Gamma_i\Gamma_{i+1} \leq 1$. As an irreducible component of the curve $\overline{B}_i$, Γ_i is disjoint from the nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_3$. Now fix i. If $\Gamma_i\Gamma_{i+1} = 0$, then blowing down Γ_i and Γ_{i+1}, we obtain a rational surface W' containing four disjoint nodal curves and $\rho(W') = 5$. This gives a contradiction to [DMP, Theorem 3.3]. The claim is proved and thus $(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3)^2 = 3$. Since $-K_W(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3) = 3$, the algebraic index theorem implies $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 \equiv -K_W$.

Since $F_1, F_1' \in |M|$ and $M \equiv K_W + D \equiv 3K_W + \overline{B}_1 + \overline{B}_2 + \overline{B}_3$, $F_1 + F_2 + F_3 \equiv -2K_W$ by (4.9). It follows that $F_i(F_1 + F_2 + F_3) = 4$ and $F_iF_{i+1} = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Since $\overline{B}_i$ is a disjoint union of smooth curves, we have $\Gamma_1F_2 = 0, \Gamma_2F_3 = 0$ and $\Gamma_3F_1 = 0$. Also $5 = \overline{B}_1\overline{B}_2 = (\Gamma_1 + F_2)(\Gamma_2 + F_3) = 3 + \Gamma_1F_3 + \Gamma_2F_2$, i.e., $\Gamma_1F_3 + \Gamma_2F_2 = 2$. Similarly, $\overline{B}_1\overline{B}_3 = 9$ and $\overline{B}_2\overline{B}_3 = 7$ imply that $2\Gamma_1F_1 + \Gamma_3F_2 = 4$ and $2\Gamma_2F_1 + \Gamma_3F_3 = 2$. Note that $(F_1+F_2+F_3)\Gamma_i = -2K_W\Gamma_i = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. It follows that $\Gamma_iF_i = 2$ and $F_i\Gamma_{i+1} = F_i\Gamma_{i+2} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since $(\Gamma_i + F_i)^2 = 3$ and $-K_W(\Gamma_i + F_i) = 3$, the algebraic index theorem gives $\Gamma_i + F_i \equiv -K_W$. □

Lemma 4.11. *The surface W is the minimal resolution of the 4-nodal cubic surface.*

Proof. It is well known that any weak Del Pezzo surface of degree three is the minimal resolution of a normal cubic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$. We have seen that W contains four nodal curves $\overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_3$. Assume that C is a nodal curve on W. Because $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 \equiv -K_W$ and $\Gamma_i + F_i \equiv -2K_W$, $\Gamma_i C = F_i C = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then $DC = 0$ by (2.5) and (4.9). Lemma 2.4 (f) implies $C \in \overline{N}_1 \cup \overline{N}_3$. Hence W contains exactly four nodal curves and it is the minimal resolution of the 4-nodal cubic surface. □

We have shown in diagram (2.3) that the cover $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ is branched on $\overline{B}_1 + \overline{N}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3 + \overline{N}_3$, where both $\overline{N}_1$ and $\overline{N}_3$ consist of two disjoint nodal curves, $\overline{B}_1, \overline{B}_2$ and $\overline{B}_3$ are described in Lemma 4.10. We conclude that $F_2 + \overline{N}_1$ and $F_2 + \overline{N}_3$ are divisible in $\mathrm{Pic}(W)$ by (2.4) and (4.9). It follows that the two nodal curves in $\overline{N}_k$ $(k = 1, 3)$ are in the same singular member of the pencil $|F_2|$. Comparing with (4.9) and Example 3.1, we conclude that S is an Inoue surface by Remark 3.2.

5 Deformations and the moduli space

We study the local deformations and the moduli of the surfaces in the case (b) of Theorem 1.1. These surfaces are exactly the ones in Example 3.3. Our goal is to prove Theorem 1.2. Throughout this section, we assume that S is a smooth minimal surface in Example 3.3. We denote by Θ_S the tangent sheaf of S. The following proposition estimates the dimension of the cohomology group $H^2(S, \Theta_S)$.

Proposition 5.1. *The dimensions of the eigenspaces of $H^2(S, \Theta_S)$ (for the G-action) satisfy the following properties:*

$$\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\mathrm{inv}} = 0,\ \dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\chi_1} \le 2,\ \dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\chi_2} \le 2,\ \dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\chi_3} \le 3.$$

We use the methods in [BC1], [BC2], [BC3] and [Ch1] to prove Proposition 5.1. The techniques involved depend on the exact sequences in [EV, Properties 2.3 (c), p. 13]. We also need the following lemma, which generalizes [BC1, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 5.2 ([Ch1, Lemma 4.4])**.** *Let X be a projective smooth surface. Let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{k-1}$ and Y be k irreducible smooth curves on X. Assume that $Y_1 + \ldots + Y_{k-1} + Y$ has only nodes. Then there is an exact sequence*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \Omega^1_X(\log Y_1, \ldots, \log Y_{k-1}, \log Y) \to \Omega^1_X(\log Y_1, \ldots, \log Y_{k-1})(Y) \\ \to \Omega^1_Y(Y_1 + \ldots + Y_{k-1} + Y) \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a divisor of X and $Y.(K_X + 2Y + Y_1 + \ldots + Y_{k-1} + \mathcal{L}) < 0$, then

$$\dim H^0(X, \Omega^1_X(\log Y_1, \ldots, \log Y_{k-1})(Y + \mathcal{L})) = \dim H^0(X, \Omega^1_X(\log Y_1, \ldots, \log Y_{k-1}, \log Y)(\mathcal{L})).$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. We recall in the Example 3.3 that V is a blowup of the surface S and $\overline{\pi}\colon V \to W$ is a finite Galois G $(\cong \mathbb{Z}_2^2)$-cover branched on Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3 (see the diagram (2.3) and (3.4)). We often refer to Example 3.3 (2)-(4) for the intersection numbers of the curves and the classes of curves in the Picard group $\mathrm{Pic}(W) \cong H^2(W, \mathbb{Z})$.

Denote by Θ_V the tangent sheaf of the surface V. Because blowing down a (-1)-curve does not change the dimension of the second cohomology group of the tangent sheaf, we have $\dim H^2(S, \Theta_S)^{\mathrm{inv}} = \dim H^2(V, \Theta_V)^{\mathrm{inv}}$ and $\dim H^2(S, \Theta_V)^{\chi_i} = \dim H^2(V, \Theta_V)^{\chi_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Serre duality implies $H^2(V,\Theta_V)\cong H^0(V,\Omega^1_V\otimes\Omega^2_V)^*$. The G-cover structure gives (cf. [Cat2, Theorem 2.16])

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\pi}_*(\Omega^1_V\otimes\Omega^2_V)&=\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W)\oplus(\oplus_{i=1}^3\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_i)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_i))\\ H^2(V,\Omega^1_V\otimes\Omega^2_V)&=H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W))\\ &\quad\oplus(\oplus_{i=1}^3H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_i)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_i))),\end{aligned}\tag{5.1}$$

where the invertible sheaves $\mathcal{L}_1,\mathcal{L}_2,\mathcal{L}_3$ are given by (3.5). It is sufficient to calculate the dimension of each summand.

We first prove that $H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W))=0$. We have the following exact sequence from [Cat2, Lemma 3.7] and [CHKS, Lemma 3]

$$0\to\Omega^1_W(K_W)\to\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W)\to\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W)\to 0\tag{5.2}$$

Since $H^0(W,\Omega^1_W)=0$ and $-K_W$ is effective, $H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(K_W))=0$. It suffices to show that the boundary map

$$\delta\colon H^0(W,\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W))\to H^1(W,\Omega^1_W(K_W))$$

is injective. The linear system $|-K_W|$ has only one simple base point because W is a weak Del Pezzo surface of degree one. So there is a morphism $\mathcal{O}_W(K_W)\to\mathcal{O}_W$, which is not identically zero on any component of the divisors Δ_i. This morphism $\mathcal{O}_W(K_W)\to\mathcal{O}_W$ induces a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}0&\longrightarrow&\Omega^1_W(K_W)&\longrightarrow&\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W)&\longrightarrow&\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W)&\longrightarrow&0\\ &&\downarrow&&\downarrow&&\downarrow&&\\ 0&\longrightarrow&\Omega^1_W&\longrightarrow&\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)&\longrightarrow&\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}&\longrightarrow&0\end{array}$$

It gives a commutative diagram of cohomology groups

$$\begin{array}{ccc}H^0(W,\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W))&\xrightarrow{\delta}&H^1(W,\Omega^1_W(K_W))\\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle\psi_2}&\searrow^{\psi}&\downarrow\\ H^0(W,\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i})&\xrightarrow{\psi_1}&H^1(W,\Omega^1_W)\end{array}$$

Note that $H^0(W,\oplus_{i=1}^3\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W))\cong\oplus_{i=1}^3H^0(W,\mathcal{O}_{C_i})\oplus H^0(W,\mathcal{O}_{C_i'})$. By [Cat2, Lemma 3.7], the image of the function identically equal to 1 on C_i (respectively C_i') maps under ψ_1 to the first Chern class of C_i (respectively C_i'). Because the curves C_i and C_i' are disjoint nodal curves, their Chern classes are linearly independent in $H^1(W,\Omega^1_W)$. Thus the composite map $\psi=\psi_1\psi_2$ is injective. It follows that δ is also injective. We thus get

$$\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\mathrm{inv}}=\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1,\log\Delta_2,\log\Delta_3)(K_W))=0.$$

We now calculate $\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_1))$. Applying the last statement of Lemma 5.2 to Γ,C_3 and C_3', we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_1)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_1))=\\ &\quad\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log F_b,\log C_1,\log C_1',\log C_2,\log C_2',\log C_3,\log C_3')(K_W+\mathcal{L}_1-C_3-C_3'+\Gamma))\end{aligned}\tag{5.3}$$

Note that $K_W+\mathcal{L}_1-C_3-C_3'+\Gamma\equiv(-K_W-E_3')-(L-E_0-2E_3')+(L-E_0-E)=-K_W+E_3'-E$ (see (3.5) and (3.3)). By Lemma 3.4, $|-K_W+E_3'-E|$ consists of a (-1)-curve Λ and Λ meets

F_b transversely. Now $\Lambda(K_W+2\Lambda+F_b+C_1+\ldots+C_3')=1$, Lemma 5.2 gives the following exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}0 \to \Omega^1_W(\log F_b, \log C_1, \log C_1', \log C_2, \log C_2', \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Lambda)\\ \to \Omega^1_W(\log F_b, \log C_1, \log C_1', \log C_2, \log C_2', \log C_3, \log C_3')(\Lambda) \to \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(1) \to 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first Chern classes of $F_b, C_1, \ldots, C_3'$ and Λ are linearly independent in $H^2(W, \mathbb{C})$. By [Cat2, Lemma 3.7], it follows that

$$H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log F_b, \log C_1, \log C_1', \log C_2, \log C_2', \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Lambda)) = 0.$$

From the long exact sequence of cohomology we conclude that

$$\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log F_b, \log C_1, \log C_1', \log C_2, \log C_2', \log C_3, \log C_3')(\Lambda)) \leq 2 \tag{5.4}$$

We thus get $\dim H^2(S, \Theta_S)^{\chi_1} = h^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_1)) \leq 2$ by (5.3) and (5.4).

We proceed to calculate $\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_2)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2))$. Note that Γ intersects $\overline{B}_2$ transversely (see Example 3.3 (4)) and $\Gamma(K_W+2\Gamma+\overline{B}_2+C_3+C_3'+(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma))=0$. Lemma 5.2 yields an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}0 \to \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma)\\ \to \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3')(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2) \to \mathcal{O}_\Gamma \to 0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3')(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2))\\ \leq \dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma)) + 1\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Note that $\overline{B}_2(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma)=0$. Tensoring the following exact sequence (cf. [EV] Properties 2.3 (b))

$$\begin{aligned}0 \to \Omega^1_W(\log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)\\ \to \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma) \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{B}_2} \to 0\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{O}_W(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_2, \log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma))\\ \leq \dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma)) + 1\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Note that $K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma \equiv L-E_0-E_1'-E_2' \equiv C_1+E_1'+C_1'-E_2'$. Applying the last statement of Lemma 5.2 to C_1, E_1' and C_1', we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2-\Gamma))\\ = \dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma, \log C_1, \log E_1', \log C_1')(-E_2'))\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

The first Chern classes of $\Gamma, C_3, C_3', C_1, E_1', C_1'$ are linearly independent in $H^2(S, \mathbb{C})$. By [Cat2, Lemma 3.7], it follows that

$$\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log C_3, \log C_3', \log \Gamma, \log C_1, \log E_1', \log C_1')(-E_2')) = 0 \tag{5.8}$$

We thus obtain $\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\chi_2} = \dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_2)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_2)) \leq 2$ from (5.5)-(5.8).

It remains to calculate $\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log\Delta_3)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3))$. Note that $\Delta_3 = \overline{B}_3 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\overline{B}_3(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3) = 2$. Tensoring the exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega^1_W \to \Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_3) \to \mathcal{O}_{\overline{B}_3} \to 0$$

with $\mathcal{O}_W(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3)$, we have

$$\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log \overline{B}_3))(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3)) \leq \dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3)) + 3 \tag{5.9}$$

Note that $K_W+\mathcal{L}_3 \equiv (C_1+E_1'+C_1') + (C_2+E_2'+C_2') - E_3'$. Applying the last statement of Lemma 5.2 to $C_1, E_1', C_1', C_2, E_2'$ and C_2', we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3)) = \\ &\qquad \dim H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log C_1,\log E_1',\log C_1',\log C_2,\log E_2',\log C_2')(-E_3'))\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

The Chern classes of $C_1, E_1', C_1', C_2, E_2'$ and C_2' are linear independent. By [Cat2, Lemma 3.7], it follows that

$$H^0(W,\Omega^1_W(\log C_1,\log E_1',\log C_1',\log C_2,\log E_2',\log C_2')(-E_3')) = 0 \tag{5.11}$$

We obtain $\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S)^{\chi_3} = h^0(W,\mathcal{O}_W(\log\Delta_3)(K_W+\mathcal{L}_3)) \leq 3$ from (5.9)-(5.11) and complete the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 1.2. From the construction of the surfaces in Example 3.3, it is clear that $\mathfrak{B}$ is irreducible, unirational and of dimension 3 (see also [Ch2, Section 3]).

Let S be a surface in Example 3.3. Since $-\dim H^1(S,\Theta_S)+\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S) = 2K_S^2-10\chi(S) = 4$, by Proposition 5.1, we have $\dim H^2(S,\Theta_S) \leq 7$ and $\dim H^1(S,\Theta_S) \leq 3$. Because S is smooth and K_S is ample, the minimal model and the canonical model of S coincide. We denote by $\mathrm{B}(S)$ the base of the Kuranishi family of deformations of S and by $[S]$ the corresponding point of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7}$. Recall the fact that the germ of the complex space $(\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7},[S])$ is analytically isomorphic to the quotient $\mathrm{B}(S)/\mathrm{Aut}(S)$.

We have the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}3 \geq \dim H^1(S,\Theta_S) &\geq \text{the dimension of } \mathrm{B}(S)\\ &= \text{the dimension of } (\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7},[S])\\ &\geq \text{the local dimension of } \mathfrak{B} \text{ at the point } [S] = 3.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently all the equalities hold. The second equality shows that $\mathrm{B}(S)$ is smooth. Therefore $(\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7},[S])$ is normal. Since $\mathfrak{B}$ is irreducible, the last equality shows that $\mathfrak{B}$ coincides with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7}$ locally at $[S]$ for any S in Example 3.3. Hence $\mathfrak{B}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ is normal.

It remains to prove that $\mathfrak{B}$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7}$. It suffices to prove the following statement. *Let T be a smooth affine curve and $o \in T$. Let $\mathcal{F}\colon \mathcal{S} \to T$ be a flat family of canonical models of surfaces of general type with $K^2 = 7$ and $p_g = 0$. Set $\mathcal{S}_t := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(t)$ for $t \in T$. Assume that $\mathcal{S}_t$ is a surface in Example 3.3 for $t \neq o$. Then so is $\mathcal{S}_o$.*

In fact, by construction, we have a G ($\cong \mathbb{Z}_2^2$)-action on $\mathcal{S}\setminus\mathcal{S}_o$. The G-action extends to $\mathcal{S}$ by [Cat1, Theorem 1.8]. In particular, $\mathcal{S}_o$ admits a G-action. This action lifts to the minimal model $\mathcal{S}_o'$ of $\mathcal{S}_o$. By Proposition 2.7 (e), the canonical divisor of $\mathcal{S}_o'$ is ample and thus $\mathcal{S}_o = \mathcal{S}_o'$. It suffices to show that the pair $(\mathcal{S}_o, G)$ satisfies property (b) of Theorem 1.1.

For $t \in T$, we denote by $\mathcal{R}_t$ be the union of the divisorial parts of the fixed loci of the three involutions g_1, g_2 and g_3. Since $\mathcal{F}\colon \mathcal{S} \to T$ is a flat family with the G-action on each fiber, $K_{\mathcal{S}_o}\mathcal{R}_o \geq K_{\mathcal{S}_t}\mathcal{R}_t$ for $t \neq o$. From the construction in Example 3.3, we have $K_{\mathcal{S}_t}\mathcal{R}_t = 5{+}5{+}3 = 13$ for $t \neq o$ and thus $K_{\mathcal{S}_o}\mathcal{R}_o \geq 13$. We see that $(\mathcal{S}_o, G)$ satisfies the property (a) or (b) of Theorem 1.1.

Set $\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{S}/G$. Then $\mathcal{Y} \to T$ is a flat family of surfaces with only nodes. For $t \neq o$, by construction, $\mathcal{Y}_t := \mathcal{S}_t/G$ is a 6-nodal singular Del Pezzo surface. It follows that $\mathcal{Y}_o := \mathcal{S}_o/G$ has at least 6 nodes. Since the quotient of an Inoue surface is the 4-nodal cubic surface, by Theorem 1.1, $(\mathcal{S}_o, G)$ satisfies property (b) and $\mathcal{S}_o$ is indeed a surface in Example 3.3.

Hence $\mathfrak{B}$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{can}}_{1,7}$ and we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. □.

Remark 5.3. From the proof of Theorem 1.2, we see that all the inequalities in Proposition 5.1 hold, $\dim H^1(S, \Theta_S) = 7$ and $\dim H^2(S, \Theta_S) = 3$. We can also calculate the dimensions of the eigenspaces of $H^1(S, \Theta_S)$ (for the G-action):

$$\dim H^1(S, \Theta_S)^{\mathrm{inv}} = 3 \text{ and } \dim H^2(S, \Theta_S)^{\chi_i} = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

It suffices to show that $\dim H^1(S, \Theta_S)^{\mathrm{inv}} = 3$, i.e., $\dim H^1(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1, \log \Delta_2, \log \Delta_3)(K_W)) = 3$ by (5.1). We have seen that $\dim H^0(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1, \log \Delta_2, \log \Delta_3)(K_W)) = 0$. Note that $H^2(W, \Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1, \log \Delta_2, \log \Delta_3)(K_W))$ is a direct sum of $H^0(V, \Theta_V)$ by (5.1). Since V is of general type, $H^0(V, \Theta_V) = 0$. It suffices to show that $\chi(\Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1, \log \Delta_2, \log \Delta_3)(K_W)) = -3$. From the exact sequence (5.2), we have

$$\chi(\Omega^1_W(\log \Delta_1, \log \Delta_2, \log \Delta_3)(K_W) = \chi(\Omega^1_W(K_W)) + \chi(\oplus_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W)).$$

The splitting principle and the Riemann-Roch theorem imply $\chi(\Omega^1_W(K_W)) = -8$. Each component of Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3 is a smooth rational curve (See (3.4)). We obtain $\chi(\oplus_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_i}(K_W)) = 5$ by Riemann-Roch Theorem and complete the proof.

Acknowledgement. Part of this work is from the author's Ph. D thesis at the Peking University. The author gratefully acknowledges the helpful suggestions of his former supervisor Jinxing Cai. The author thanks Xiaotao Sun for all the support during the preparation of the paper. The author is greatly indebted to Yifei Chen, Wenfei Liu, Jinsong Xu and Lei Zhang for many discussions. The author wishes to thank Christopher Hacon for the invitation to the University of Utah and for the hospitality. This work is partially supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No.: 2013M541062).

References

[BHPV] W. Barth, K. Hulek, C. Peters, and A. Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces, 2nd edition*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 3. Folge. 4. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[BCP] I. Bauer, F. Catanese, and R. Pignatelli, *Surfaces with geometric genus zero: A survey*, In:Proceedings of the conference Complex and Differential Geometry held in Hannover, 14 - 18 September 2009, 1-48.

[BC1] I. Bauer and F. Catanese, *Burniat surfaces II: Secondary Burniat surfaces form three connected components of the moduli space*, Invent. Math. **180** (2010), no. 3, 559–588.

[BC2] ———, *Inoue type manifolds and Inoue surfaces: a connected component of the moduli space of surfaces with $K^2 = 7, p_g = 0$*, Geometry and Arithmetic (2012), 23-56.

[BC3] ———, *Burniat surfaces III: Deformations of automorphisms and extended Burniat surfaces*, Documenta Mathematica **18** (2013), 1089-1136.

[Ba] I. Bauer, *Bloch's conjecture for Inoue surfaces with $p_g = 0, K^2 = 7$*, preprint, arXiv:1210.4287 (2012).

[Bu] P. Burniat, *Sur les surfaces de genre $P_{12} > 0$*, Ann. Math. Pura Appl. **71** (1966), 1-24.

[CCM] A. Calabri, C. Ciliberto, and M. Mendes Lopes, *Numerical Godeaux surfaces with an involution*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **359** (2007), no. 4, 1605-1632.

[Cam] L. Campedelli, *Sopra alcuni piani doppi notevoli con curve di diramazioni del decimo ordine*, Atti Acad. Naz. Lincei **15** (1932), 536-542.

[CFHR] F. Catanese, M. Franciosi, K. Hulek, and M. Reid, *Embeddings of curves and surfaces*, Nagoya Mathematical Journal **154** (1999), 185–220.

[CHKS] F. Catanese, S. Hoşten, A. Khetan, and B. Sturmfels, *The maximum likelihood degree*, American Journal of Mathematics **128 (3)** (2006), 671–697.

[Cat1] F. Catanese, *Moduli of surfaces of general type*, In: Algebraic geometry–open problems (Ravello, 1982), Lecture Notes in Math. **977** (1983), 90-112.

[Cat2] ———, *On the moduli spaces of surfaces of general type*, J. Differential Geom. **19** (1984), no. 2, 483–515.

[Cat3] ———, *Singular bidouble covers and the construction of interesting algebraic surfaces*, Algebraic geometry: Hirzebruch 70 (Warsaw, 1998), Contemporary Mathematics **241** (1999), 97–120.

[Car] H. Cartan, *Quotient d'un espace analytique par un groupe d'automorphismes*, In: Algebraic geometry and topology: A Symposium in honour of S. Lefschetz, Princeton Math. Series **12** (1957), 90–102.

[Ch1] Y. Chen, *Keum-Naie-Mendes Lopes-Pardini surfaces yield an irreducible component of the moduli space*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **45** (2013), 921-929.

[Ch2] ———, *A new family of surfaces of general type with $K^2 = 7$ and $p_g = 0$*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **275** (2013), 1275-1286.

[DMP] I. Dolgachev, M. Mendes Lopes, and R. Pardini, *Rational surfaces with many nodes*, Compositio Mathematica **132** (2002), no. 3, 349–363.

[EV] H. Esnault and E. Viehweg, *Lectures on Vanishing Theorems*, DMV-Seminar 20 (1992). Birkhäuser, Basel-Boston-Berlin.

[Gi] D. Gieseker, *Global moduli for surfaces of general type*, Inv. Math. **43** (1977), 233-282.

[Go] L. Godeaux, *Les involutions cycliques appartenant à une surface algébrique*, Actual. Sci. Ind. **270** (1935).

[In] M. Inoue, *Some new surfaces of general type*, Tokyo Journal of Mathematics **17** (1994), no. 2, 295–319.

[KL] J. Keum and Y. Lee, *Fixed locus of an involution acting on a Godeaux surface*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **129** (2000), no. 2, 205-216.

[Ke] J. Keum, *Projective surfaces with many nodes*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 60, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo (2010), 245-257.

[LS] Y. Lee and Y. Shin, *Involutions on a surface of general type with $p_g = q = 0$, $K^2 = 7$*, Osaka J. Math, in press, arXiv:1003.3595 (2010).

[MP1] M. Mendes Lopes and R. Pardini, *The bicanonical map of surfaces with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 \geq 7$*, Bull. London Math. Soc **33** (2001), no. 3, 265–274.

[MP2] ———, *The bicanonical map of surfaces with $p_g = 0$ and $K^2 \geq 7$, II*, Bull. London Math. Soc **35** (2003), no. 3, 337–343.

[Me] M. Mendes Lopes, *Adjoint systems on surfaces*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. A (7) **10** (1996), no. 1, 169–179.

[Pe] C. Peters, *On certain examples of surfaces with $p_g = 0$ due to Burniat*, Nagoya Math. J. **66** (1977), 109-119.

[Ri] C. Rito, *Some bidouble planes with $p_g = q = 0$ and $4 \leq K^2 \leq 7$*, preprint, arXiv:1103.2940 (2011).

[Xi] G. Xiao, *Finitude de l'application bicanonique des surfaces de type général*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **113** (1985), 23–51.